

Università degli Studi di Salerno  
Centro di Economia del Lavoro e di Politica Economica

Roberto Basile  
*ISAE, Roma – Università di Macerata*

Mauro Costantini  
*ISAE, Roma – Università “La Sapienza” di Roma*

Sergio Destefanis  
*CELPE, CSEF – Università di Salerno*

Unit root and cointegration tests  
for cross-sectionally correlated panels.  
Estimating regional production functions

Discussion Paper 94  
Maggio, 2005

*CELPE*

*Centro di Economia del Lavoro e di Politica Economica*

*Università degli Studi di Salerno*

*Via Ponte Don Mellillo, 84084 Fisciano, Italy*

Web Page: <http://www.celpe.unisa.it/>

E-mail: [celpe@unisa.it](mailto:celpe@unisa.it)

**Scientific Committee:**

*Adalgiso Amendola, Guido Cella, Ugo Colombino, Cesare Imbriani, Giancarlo Marini, Pasquale Persico, Nicola Postiglione, Enrico Pugliese, Salvatore Vinci*

## *Index*

1. <i>Introduction</i> .....	5
2. <i>The Model</i> .....	6
3. <i>Econometric Methodology</i> .....	8
4. <i>Data and Empirical Results</i> .....	14
5. <i>Concluding Remarks</i> .....	16
<i>Appendix</i> .....	18
<i>References</i> .....	31

# Unit root and cointegration tests for cross-sectionally correlated panels. Estimating regional production functions

Roberto Basile

*ISAE, Roma – Università di Macerata*

Mauro Costantini

*ISAE, Roma – Università “La Sapienza” di Roma*

Sergio Destefanis

*CELPE, CSEF – Università di Salerno*

May, 2005

## Abstract

This paper employs recently developed non stationary panel methodologies that assume some cross-section dependence to estimate the production function for Italian regions in the industrial sector over the period 1970-1998. The analysis consists in three steps. First, unit root tests for cross-sectionally dependent panels are used. Second, the existence of a co-integrating relationship among value added, physical capital and human capital-augmented labor is investigated. The Dynamic OLS (DOLS) and Fully modified (FMOLS) estimators developed by Pedroni (1996, 2000, 2001) and the Panel Dynamic OLS (PDOLS) estimator proposed by Mark and Sul (2003) are then used to estimate the long run relationship between the variables considered.

Jel Codes: C33, C15, D24

Keywords: panel cointegration, cross-section dependence, production function.

# 1. Introduction<sup>\*</sup>

There is a plethora of studies which estimate aggregate production functions using macro panel data for countries or regions (e.g. Aschauer, 1989; Holtz-Eakin, 1994; Islam, 1995; Garcia-Milà et al., 1996). More recent works consider non-stationary panel data techniques (e.g. McCoskey and Kao, 1999; Canning, 1999; Marrocu et al., 2000). All of them assume the hypothesis of cross-section independence. Here, we claim that the independence assumption is too strong, especially when regional data are used, since co-movements of economic variables between one region and another are usually observed because of spill-over effects. In this case, it is not appropriate to test the stationarity of the GDP, or other macroeconomics variables, of one region without taking into account the relationship between this GDP and the GDP of the other regions belonging to the same country. Estimation of production functions should then also allow for common time effects controlling for factors simultaneously affecting all regions.

In this paper, a regional production function in the industrial sector is estimated for Italian regions over the period 1970-1998 by using recent non-stationary panel estimators that assume some sort of cross-section dependence. The analysis consists in three steps. First, unit roots properties of the panel dataset are properly investigated by applying newly developed tests for cross-sectionally dependent panels. Second, the existence of a co-integrating relationship among value added, physical capital and human capital-augmented labor is also investigated in a cross-section dependence framework. Finally, the Dynamic OLS (DOLS) and Fully modified (FMOLS) estimators constructed by Pedroni (1996, 2000, 2001) and the Panel dynamic OLS estimator (PDOLS) (Mark and Sul, 2003) are used in order to estimate the long run relationship between the variables considered.<sup>1</sup> All the estimators take into account some degree of cross-section dependence.

Our results provide robust evidence in favor of a cointegrating relationship between regional value added, physical capital and human capital-augmented labor. The estimated long-run input elasticities suggests that allowance for common time effects and individual trends usually implies that the regional production function is characterized by constant returns to scale. Otherwise, the production function exhibits slightly increasing returns to scale.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the model. Section 3 discusses the econometric methodology. Data and empirical results are presented in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

---

<sup>\*</sup> We are grateful to Luciano Gutierrez for helpful feedback on a previous draft. The usual disclaimer obviously applies. Destefanis gratefully acknowledges financial support from the MIUR.

<sup>1</sup> The PDOLS estimator is a within dimension panel estimator. The DOLS and FMOLS estimators proposed by Pedroni (1996, 2000, 2001) are between estimators.

## 2. The model

We estimate a Cobb-Douglas production function for the Italian regions adopting the human capital specification suggested by Hall and Jones (1999):

$$Y_{i,t} = A_{i,t} (K_{i,t})^\alpha (L_{i,t} h_{i,t})^\beta \quad (1)$$

where  $Y_{i,t}$  is the value added in region  $i$  at time period  $t$ ,  $K_{i,t}$  is the stock of physical capital and  $L_{i,t} h_{i,t}$  is the amount of human capital-augmented labor used in production (with  $h_{i,t}$  the human capital per worker and  $L_{i,t}$  the total number of workers).  $A_{i,t}$  is the specification for (Hicks-neutral) technology and it is the term which introduces a stochastic element into the model. Specifically, we define a simple knowledge production function for region  $i$  at time  $t$  as follows:

$$A_{i,t} = e^{\gamma_i + \delta_i t + \theta_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}} \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma_i$  is a region-specific constant which captures the intrinsic efficiency in technology production, the component  $\delta_i t$  catches the growth path of region-specific efficiency in producing technology,  $\theta_t$  captures the worldwide (or countrywide) knowledge accumulation and  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  introduces a random shock in the knowledge production function. The common time effect  $\theta_t$  is introduced since we assume that some technology spreads across regional boundaries through international and interregional trade which also implies that regional economies cannot be regarded as technologically independent. Therefore, the regional production function is estimated taking into account the cross-regional dependence.<sup>2</sup>

As usual, labor  $L_{i,t}$  is assumed to be homogenous within a region and  $h_{i,t}$  is a transformation of  $E_{i,t}$  that measures the education level of each labor unit in terms of years of schooling. Thus, human capital-augmented labor is given by

$$L_{i,t} h_{i,t} = L_{i,t} e^{\phi(E_{i,t})}$$

In this specification, the function  $\phi(E)$  reflects the efficiency of a labor unit with  $E$  years of schooling relative to one with no education ( $\phi(0)=0$ ). The derivative is the

---

<sup>2</sup> Obviously, this represents a very simple way of modelling technology. First, in our model, technology and technological change are completely exogenous. Specifically, we decided not to endogenize technological change (for example by introducing R&D investments within the knowledge production function), since we do not have data on technology (such as R&D expenditure or number of patents) at regional level for the whole time period considered in the empirical analysis. Second, the assumption of Hicks-neutral technological progress implies that technological change is fully disembodied and it depends only on time.

return to schooling estimated in a Mincerian wage regression: an additional year of schooling raises a worker's efficiency proportionally by  $\phi'(E)$ .

Taking logs, equation (1) can be written as follows:

$$\ln Y_{i,t} = \gamma_i + \delta_i t + \theta_t + \alpha \ln K_{i,t} + \beta \ln L_{i,t} h_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

The panel model includes a region-specific effect  $\gamma_i$ , a region-specific linear trend  $\delta_i t$  and a common time-specific factor  $\theta_t$ . The two parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  can be interpreted as the elasticities of output with respect to physical capital and human capital-augmented labor.

In this paper, equation (3) is estimated by using a panel data set of 20 Italian regions over the period 1970-1998. Several approaches have been used in the literature to study aggregate production functions. Mankiw et al. (1992) estimate a cross-country production function for physical and human capital. Aschauer (1989), Holtz-Eakin (1994), Garcia-Milà et al. (1996) estimate production function models including public capital infrastructure using data on the US States (all these studies do not explicitly consider the non-stationary nature of the data). Canning (1999) uses annual cross-country data for the period 1960-1990 to analyse an aggregate production function incorporating labor, physical capital, human capital and infrastructure adopting non-stationary panel data approaches under the assumption of cross-section independence. McCoskey and Kao (1999) estimate a production function incorporating capital, labor and a measure of the urbanization level adopting non-stationary panel data approaches under the assumption of cross-section independence.

A methodology alternative to the econometric estimation of production function is the so-called "level accounting" approach (e.g. Hall and Jones, 1999). For example, under the hypothesis of constant returns to scale (i.e.  $\beta=1-\alpha$ ) and a fixed value for the  $\alpha$  parameter, Hall and Jones (1999) calculate the level of total factor productivity (TFP) for a cross-country sample. They use a production function similar to equation (1), but with a Harrod-neutral technology and with the assumption of constant return to scale. This specification allows them to decompose differences in output per worker across countries into differences in the capital-output ratio, differences in educational attainment and differences in TFP. The same approach has been used by Aiello and Scoppa (2000) to derive the TFP for Italian regions. Aiello and Scoppa assume constant returns to scale and a uniform cross-region capital elasticity (given by 0.38, the ratio of gross profits to value added for Italy) in order to compute the regional TFP levels.

This methodology has been criticized on the grounds of the restrictive assumptions needed for the computation of the Solow residual. As emphasised by Marrocu et al. (2000), this procedure does not take into account the high heterogeneity existing among regions and sectors. Indeed Marrocu et al. provide an example of estimation of regional production functions for Italy with physical capital and labor inputs. They consider a period extending over the last three decades and use non-stationary panel approaches not allowing for cross-sectional dependence.

However, the cross-sectional independence assumption is too strong, especially for regional data: co-movements of economic variables between one region and another are usually observed because of spillover effects. Following the estimation approach rather than the “level accounting” approach, in the present paper we impose no restrictive assumptions on the technology parameters, releasing in particular the hypothesis of constant returns to scale. Working with a long panel dataset, we adopt non-stationary panel methods explicitly allowing for common time effects. In this way we capture to some extent the influence of cross-regional dependence. These panel methods also allow in various manners for heterogeneity across regions.<sup>3</sup>

### 3. Econometric methodology

The empirical analysis consists in three steps. First, the panel properties of the variables are properly investigated. In the first generation of panel unit root (Levin and Lin, 1992, 1993; Levin et al., 2002; Im et al., 1997, 2003; Choi, 2001; Maddala and Wu, 1999) correlations across units constitute nuisance parameters. The cross-sectional independence hypothesis is rather restrictive and somewhat unrealistic in the majority of macroeconomic applications of unit root tests (Phillips and Sul, 2003; O’Connel, 1998), where co-movements of economies are often observed. Rather than considering correlations across units as nuisance parameters, the second generation of panel unit root (Phillips and Sul, 2003; Chang, 2002 and 2003; Choi, 2004a; Bai and Ng, 2003; Moon and Perron, 2004; Pesaran, 2005)<sup>4</sup> aims at exploiting these co-movements in order to define new test statistics. In this paper four cross-sectional dependent panel unit root tests are performed: Choi (2004a, hereafter CH), Bai and Ng (2003, hereafter BNG), Moon and Perron (2004, hereafter MP) and Pesaran (2005, hereafter PS).<sup>5</sup>

Second, a set of panel cointegration tests are applied. The ADF test (Kao, 1999) and the  $WR_M$  test (Westerlund, 2004) are applied. In Kao (1999) the hypothesis of homogeneity of the cointegrating vector among individual members of the panel is assumed. The  $WR_M$  test allows for cross-sectional dependence.

Finally, the long run relationship is estimated by using the DOLS and FMOLS estimators developed by Pedroni (1996, 2000 and 2001, hereafter PED) and the PDOLS estimator provided by Mark and Sul (2003, hereafter MS). In the PED and MS

---

<sup>3</sup> Another estimation issue pertains to the direction of causality in the relationship between output and inputs. Inputs may determine output, but output may have a feedback into factor accumulation. Thus, when we estimate equation (3), possible endogeneity problems arise, which can be solved using dynamic OLS estimators.

<sup>4</sup> A macroeconomic application is provided in Hurlin (2004).

<sup>5</sup> Gutierrez (2003) shows that the Moon and Perron’s (2004) tests have good size and power in finite samples for different specifications and different values of T and N, and that the Bai and Ng’s (2004) pooled tests of the null hypothesis that idiosyncratic components are non-stationary also have good size and power, especially when the Dickey-Fuller-GLS version of the test is used, while the ADF test used to analyze the nonstationary properties of the common component has low power. The Choi’s (2004) tests are largely oversized. Gutierrez shows that all tests lack power when a deterministic trend is included in the data generating process.



approaches a certain form of cross-sectional dependence through the presence of common time effects is assumed.

### 3.1 Panel unit root with cross-sectional dependence

CH proposed new panel unit root tests for cross-sectionally correlated panels. The cross-sectional correlation is modelled by a two-way error-component model. The test statistics are derived from combining p-values from the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test applied to each time series whose non-stochastic trend components and cross-correlation are eliminated by Elliot, Rothenberg and Stock's (1996) GLS-based de-trending and the conventional cross-sectional demeaning panel data.

The panel unit root tests developed by CH are:

$$P_m = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (\ln(p_i) + 1) \quad (4)$$

$$Z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi^{-1}(p_i) \quad (5)$$

$$L^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi^2 N/3}} \sum_{i=1}^N \ln\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right), \quad (6)$$

where  $P_m$  is a modification of Fisher (1932) inverse chi-square,  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the standard normal cumulative distribution function,  $p_i$  indicates the asymptotic p-value of the Dickey-Fuller-GLS test for region  $i$ .<sup>6</sup> For  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $P_m, Z, L^* \Rightarrow N(0,1)$

BNG consider the factor model:

$$Y_{it} = D_{it} + \lambda_i' F_t + e_{it} \quad (7)$$

where  $D_{it}$  is a polynomial trend function,  $F_t$  is an  $r \times 1$  vector of common factors, and  $\lambda_i$  is a vector of factor loadings. Thus the series  $Y_{it}$  is decomposed into three components: a deterministic one, a common component with factor structure and an idiosyncratic error component. The process  $Y_{it}$  may be non-stationary if one or more of the common factors are non-stationary, or the idiosyncratic error is non-stationary, or both. To test the stationarity of the idiosyncratic component, BNG propose to pool the individual ADF t-statistics with de-factored estimated component  $e_{it}$  in a model with no deterministic trend:

---

<sup>6</sup> The percentiles of the asymptotic p-values of the Dickey-Fuller-GLS tests are simulated by Choi.

$$\Delta e_{it} = \delta_{i,0} \hat{e}_{i,t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{i,j} \Delta \hat{e}_{i,t-j} + u_{i,t} \quad (8)$$

BNG developed a test in order to test the common factor and the idiosyncratic error separately. Let  $ADF_{\hat{e}}^c(i)$  be the ADF t-statistic for the  $i$ -th region. The asymptotic distribution of the  $ADF_{\hat{e}}^c(i)$  coincides with the Dickey-Fuller distribution for the case of no constant. However, these individual time series tests have the same low power as those based on the initial series. BNG proposed pooled tests based on Fisher's type statistics defined as in Choi (2001) and Maddala and Wu (1999). Let  $P_{\hat{e}}^c$  be the p-value associated with  $ADF_{\hat{e}}^c(i)$ , then

$$Z_{\hat{e}}^c = \frac{-2 \sum_{i=1}^N \log p_{\hat{e}}^c(i) - 2N}{\sqrt{4N}} \xrightarrow{D} N(0,1) \quad (9)$$

MP developed several unit root tests in which the cross-sectional units are correlated. To model the cross-sectional dependence, MP provided an approximate linear dynamic factor model in which the panel data are generated by both idiosyncratic shocks and unobservable dynamic factors that are common to all individual units. In our analysis, we apply the following tests:

$$t_a^* = \frac{\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\rho}_{pool}^+ - 1)}{\sqrt{\frac{2\hat{\phi}_e^4}{\omega_e^4}}} \quad (10)$$

$$t_b^* = \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\rho}_{pool}^+ - 1) \sqrt{\frac{1}{NT^2} tr(Y_{-1} Q_B Y_{-1}') \left( \frac{\hat{\omega}_e^2}{\hat{\phi}_e^4} \right)} \quad (11)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}_{pool}^+$  is the bias-corrected pooled autoregressive estimated of  $\rho_{pool}^+$ ,  $\hat{\omega}_e^2$  and  $\hat{\phi}_e^4$  are respectively the estimates of the cross sectional average of long run variance of  $\hat{e}_{it}$  and the cross sectional average of  $\hat{\omega}_{e,i}^4$ .<sup>7</sup>

PS used a different method for dealing with the problem of cross-section dependence. Instead of basing the unit root tests on deviations from the estimated factors, PS augments the standard DF (or ADF) regression with the cross section averages of lagged levels and first-differences of the individual series. The panel unit root tests are then based on the average of individual cross-sectionally augmented ADF statistics (CADF). The individual CADF statistics may be used to construct modified

---

<sup>7</sup> See the Appendix

versions of the t-bar test developed by Im et al. (2003), the inverse chi-square test (P test) developed by Maddala and Wu (1999) and the inverse normal test (Z test) proposed by Choi (2001). PS also presented a truncated version of the test in order to avoid undue influences of extreme outcomes that could emerge in the case of small T. The simple average of cross-sectionally augmented IPS test and its truncated version are also proposed:

$$CIPS(N, T) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N t_i(N, T) \quad (12)$$

and

$$CIPS^*(N, T) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N t_i^*(N, T) \quad (13)$$

where  $t_i(N, T)$  and  $t_i^*(N, T)$  are the cross-sectionally augmented Dickey-Fuller statistic for the i-th cross section unit and the truncated version respectively given by the t-ratio of the coefficient of  $y_{i,t-1}$  in the CADF regression:

$$\Delta y_{it} = a_i + b_i y_{i,t-1} + c_i y_{i,t-1} + d_i \Delta y_{it} + e_{it} \quad (14)$$

### 3.2 Panel cointegration tests

Kao (1999) proposed an Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) panel cointegration test in which cointegrating vectors are assumed to be homogeneous. Let  $\hat{e}_{it}$  be the estimated residual from the following regression:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta x_{it} + e_{it} \quad (15)$$

The ADF test is applied to the estimated residual:

$$\hat{e}_{it} = \gamma \hat{e}_{i,t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^p J_j \Delta \hat{e}_{i,t-j} + v_{i,tp} \quad (16)$$

where  $p$  is chosen so that the residual  $v_{i,tp}$  are serially uncorrelated. The ADF test statistic is the usual t-statistic of  $\rho = 1$  in the previous equation.

With the null hypothesis of no cointegration, the ADF test statistics can be constructed as:

$$ADF = \frac{t_{ADF} + \left( \sqrt{6N} \hat{\sigma}_v / 2 \hat{\sigma}_{0v} \right)}{\sqrt{\left( \hat{\sigma}_{0v}^2 / 2 \hat{\sigma}_v^2 \right) + \left( 10 \hat{\sigma}_{0v}^2 \right)}} \quad (17)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_v^2 = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{E}} - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_{0v}^2 = \Omega_u - \Omega_{u\mathcal{E}} \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega$  is the long run covariance matrix and  $t_{ADF}$  is the t-statistic in the ADF regression. Kao shows that the ADF test converges to a standard normal distribution  $N(0,1)$ .

At least, a panel co-integration test for the null hypothesis of no co-integration with cross-sectional dependence is applied. Westerlund (2004) proposed a non-parametric modified variance ratio test. He considers the following model:

$$y_{it} = z_t' \hat{\delta}_i + x_{it}' \hat{\beta}_i + \hat{e}_{it} \quad (18)$$

where  $z_t$  is the deterministic component.  $z_t$  may include a constant and linear time trend. The variance ratio test is applied to the residual of the previous regression equation. The residual  $\hat{e}_{it}$  are stationary when  $y_{it}$  and  $x_{it}$  are co-integrated. In other words, testing the null hypothesis of no co-integration is equivalent to testing the regression residuals for a unit root using the following auto-regression:

$$\hat{e}_{it} = \gamma \hat{e}_{i,t-1} + u_{it} \quad (19)$$

For the test statistic, the null hypothesis is formulated as:  $H_0 : \gamma_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , against the alternative  $H_1 : \gamma_i = \gamma < 1$  for all  $i$ .<sup>8</sup> Now, define  $\hat{E}_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^t \hat{e}_{ij}$ ,  $\hat{R}_i \equiv \sum_{t=1}^t \hat{e}_{it}^2$ ,  $\hat{E}_i = (\hat{E}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{E}_{iT})'$ ,  $\hat{E} = (\hat{E}_1, \dots, \hat{E}_N)'$ ,  $\hat{U}_i = (\hat{e}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{e}_{iT})'$  and  $\hat{U} = (\hat{U}_1, \dots, \hat{U}_N)'$ .

The modified variance ratio statistic developed by Westerlund is:

$$VR_M \equiv tr \left( \hat{E}' \hat{E} (\hat{U}' \hat{U})^{-1} \right) \quad (20)$$

---

<sup>8</sup> A rejection of the null hypothesis should therefore be taken as evidence in favour of co-integration for all individuals

### 3.3. Panel estimation of the long-run relationship

Pedroni provided the between-dimension “group mean” DOLS and FMOLS estimators. The advantage of using the between estimators is that the form in which the data is pooled allows for greater flexibility in the presence of heterogeneity of the cointegrating vectors. The test statistics derived from the between-dimension estimators are constructed to test the null hypothesis  $H_0 : \beta_i = \beta_0$  for all  $i$  against the alternative  $H_1 : \beta_i \neq \beta_0$ , so that the values for  $\beta_i$  are not constrained to be the same under the alternative hypothesis. Consider the following co-integrated system for a panel of  $i=1, 2, \dots, N$  members,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it} &= \alpha_i + \beta X_{it} + u_{it} \\ X_{it} &= X_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where  $Z_{it} = (Y_{it}, X_{it})' \sim I(1)_{it}$  and  $\xi_i = (u_{it}, \varepsilon_{it})' \sim I(0)$ , with long run covariance matrix  $\Omega_i = L_i L_i'$  ( $L_i$  is a lower triangular decomposition of  $\Omega_i$ ). In this case, the variables are said to be cointegrated for each member of the panel, with cointegrating vector  $\beta$ . The terms  $\alpha_i$  allow the cointegrating relationship to include member specific fixed effect. The covariance matrix can also be decomposed as  $\Omega_i = \Omega_i^0 + \Gamma_i + \Gamma_i'$ , where  $\Omega_i^0$  is the contemporaneous covariance and  $\Gamma_i$  is a weighted sum of autocovariances. The panel FMOLS estimator for the coefficient  $\beta$  is defined as follows:

$$\beta_{NT}^* = N^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (X_{it} - \bar{X}_i)^2 \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (X_{it} - \bar{X}_i) Y_{it}^* - T \hat{\tau}_i \right) \quad (22)$$

where  $Y_{it}^* = (Y_{it} - \bar{Y}_i) - \frac{\hat{L}_{21i}}{\hat{L}_{22i}} \Delta X_{it}$ ,  $\hat{\tau}_i \equiv \hat{\Gamma}_{21i} + \hat{\Omega}_{21i}^0 - \frac{\hat{L}_{21i}}{\hat{L}_{22i}} (\hat{\Gamma}_{22i} + \hat{\Omega}_{22i}^0)$  and  $\hat{L}_i$  is a lower triangular decomposition of  $\hat{\Omega}_i$  defined as follows:

$$\Omega_i = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{11i} & \Omega_{21i}' \\ \Omega_{21i} & \Omega_{22i} \end{bmatrix}$$

For the panel DOLS estimation, the cointegration equation (21) is augmented as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta X_{it} + \sum_{k=-K_i}^{K_i} \gamma_{ik} \Delta X_{it-k} + u_{it}^* \quad (23)$$

and the estimated coefficient  $\beta$  is given by:

$$\hat{\beta}_{GD}^* = N^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N Z_{it} Z_{it}' \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N Z_{it} Y_{it}^* \right) \quad (24)$$

where  $Z_{it} = (X_{it} - \bar{X}_i, \Delta X_{it-k}, \dots, \Delta X_{it+k})$  is  $2(K+1) \times 1$  vector of regressors.

MS assume the hypothesis that the cointegrating vector is homogenous across individuals, but they allow for individual heterogeneity through disparate short-run dynamics, individual-specific fixed effects and individual-specific time trends. Their approach also allows for some degree of cross-sectional dependence through the presence of time-specific effects. The panel estimator for the fixed effect model is  $\beta_{NT}$ , where

$$(\beta_{NT} - \beta) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{q}_{it} \tilde{q}_{it}' \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{q}_{it} \tilde{u}_{it} \right] \quad (25)$$

When individual-specific fixed effects and heterogeneous time trends are included in the model, the panel DOLS estimator is:

$$\beta_{NT} = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{q}_{it} \tilde{q}_{it}' \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{q}_{it} \tilde{y}_{it} \right] \quad (26)$$

The panel DOLS estimator with common time dummies in the model is:<sup>9</sup>

$$\gamma_{NT} = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^{\perp*} x_{it}^{\perp*0} \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^{\perp*} y_{it}^{\perp*} \right] \quad (27)$$

## 4. Data and empirical results

In our empirical analysis, we use a panel of Italian regions over the period 1970-1998. Annual data on value added and labor units in the industrial sector are taken from the Prometeia Regional Accounting data-set. The data for the stock of private capital in the industrial sector over the period 1970-1994 are provided by Paci and Pusceddu from CRENOS (University of Cagliari). Paci and Pusceddu (2000), as well as Gleed and Rees (1979), obtain the regional stocks of capital by distributing across regions the national stock of capital<sup>10</sup> through two indicator variables, namely the regional share of gross

<sup>9</sup> For further details on PDOLS estimators see Appendix.

<sup>10</sup> The data on the national stock of capital are provided by the National Institute of Statistics (Istat).

investments (given a weight of 0.75) and the regional share of labor units (given a weight of 0.25). Following the same procedure, the time series of regional physical capital has been extended until 1998.<sup>11</sup> Value added and stock of capital are measured at 1995 constant prices.

As mentioned in Section 2, the technique suggested in Hall and Jones (1999) has been adopted in order to estimate human capital. Let  $L_{it}$  be the number of employees in region  $i$  at time  $t$ , and  $F_{it}$  and  $M_{it}$  be the female and male average number of years of education in region  $i$  at time  $t$ .<sup>12</sup> Then, labor augmented for human capital accumulation in region  $i$  at time  $t$  can be defined by:

$$L_{it} h_{it} = L_{it} e_{it}^{[\phi_F F_{it} + \phi_M M_{it}]} \quad (28)$$

where  $\phi_F$  and  $\phi_M$  are the coefficients on education in the Mincer earning functions. To obtain  $L_{it} h_{it}$ , the coefficients estimated by Brunello *et al.* (1999) for Italy, are used.<sup>13</sup>

In Tables 1-3 panel unit root test results are reported. Strong evidence is found of unit root processes for all variables. With regard to value added, only the Choi test allows rejection of the null hypothesis of nonstationarity at the 5% significance level. Other tests show significant evidence in favor of a unit root process. Concerning physical capital and human capital-augmented labor, the null hypothesis of nonstationarity cannot be rejected at the 5% significance level, except for the MP statistics. However, the results of the MP test are more 'radical' since they do not test for the unit root in common factors. The rejection of the null hypothesis does not imply that non-stationarity is rejected for the idiosyncratic component of all regions, but that the null hypothesis is only rejected for a sub-group of regions. In addition, the rejection of the non-stationarity of the idiosyncratic component does not imply that the series is stationary, since the common factor may be non-stationary.

In Table 4 we report results of the panel cointegration tests. All tests show evidence of a cointegrating relationship between the three variables considered at the 5% level, meaning that the residuals in the equation (3) are stationary.

Given the evidence of stationarity of the residuals in equation (3), we proceed to estimate the long-run relationship. In Table 5, Pedroni's DOLS and FMOLS estimates are reported. The signs of coefficients are consistent with economic theory and all t-statistics are significant at the 5% level. Common time dummies are included to control for cross-sectional dependence. Evidence of constant or even decreasing returns to scale (scale elasticities are 0.99 for DOLS and 0.76 for FMOLS) is found when common time effects are included in the model. Otherwise, the regional production function exhibits slightly increasing returns to scale (scale elasticities are 1.05 and 1.15 for DOLS and FMOLS, respectively). These findings are consistent with endogenous growth theories that often

---

<sup>11</sup> In these circumstances there is clearly some collinearity between the capital and the labor input, and while we can regard with some confidence the sum of the input elasticities, not much weight should be given to size and significance of any of them in isolation (this is especially true for the stock of capital).

<sup>12</sup>  $F_{it}$  and  $M_{it}$  data are taken from Destefanis *et al.* (2004).

<sup>13</sup> The  $\phi_F$  and  $\phi_M$  coefficients are respectively equal to 0.077 and 0.062.

ascribe to spillover effects the existence of increasing returns to scale. Hence, once one controls for spillovers through the common time dummies, the evidence of increasing returns should fade out. Low coefficients on physical capital (ranging from 0.16 to 0.26) were expected given the characteristics of the data on physical capital stock.

The PDOLS estimates are presented in Table 6. The signs of the coefficients are always consistent with economic theory. The coefficients on physical capital are again rather low (ranging from 0.09 to 0.20) and not significant in the model with individual effects and heterogeneous trends as well as in the model with individual, common time effects and heterogeneous trends (see rows 3 and 4).

The values of the scale elasticities slightly diminish when common time effects are included in the regional production function: from 1.27 to 1.24 (see the first and the second row) and from 0.81 to 0.76 (see the third and the fourth row). A much bigger impact is found when individual time trends are included in the model: the scale elasticities decline from 1.27 to 0.81 in the model without common time effects and from 1.24 to 0.76 in the model with common time effects. This is not strong evidence in favor of decreasing returns to scale (constant returns to scale could be easily imposed). However this suggests that the existence of increasing returns to scale on labor and capital is actually driven by some idiosyncratic phenomena (public capital accumulation, technological diffusion, etc. ).

In a nutshell, the estimation results reported in Tables 5-6 suggest that the presence of increasing returns to scale on physical capital and human capital-augmented labor may be due to the omission of some relevant factors (such as common time effects and individual trends) from the production function. When these factors are included in the model, constant or even decreasing returns to scale are found. Unfortunately it is not easy in this framework to implement a proper significance test for common time effects or individual trends. Hence the final decision on which specification provides the most appropriate representation of the data generating process must be postponed to further research. A final remark is that the group-mean DOLS estimator from Table 5 has been found to exhibit much less size distortion relative to the within-dimension panel DOLS estimators from Table 6 (see Pedroni, 2001). In this sense, the estimates from Table 5 are arguably more trustworthy.

## 5. Concluding remarks

Whether they are based on non-stationary panel data techniques or not, aggregate production functions estimated on macro panel data for countries usually assume the hypothesis of cross-section independence. However this assumption is too strong, especially for regional data. Co-movements of economic variables between one region and another should be expected because of spillover effects, and empirical analysis should take this into account. In this paper, we exploit the time length of our panel dataset (1970-98) by using non-stationary panel methods explicitly allowing for a common time effect in order to take into account cross-regional dependence.



In providing estimates for a regional production function for the industrial sector across Italian regions, unit root properties of the panel dataset are firstly investigated through newly developed tests for cross-section dependence. After having ascertained the existence of a cointegrating relationship between value added, human capital-augmented labor and physical capital, the long-run relationship between the variables of interest is estimated through new procedures that allow for some degree of cross-section dependence.

These panel methods, which also allow for heterogeneity across regions, provide strong evidence in favour of a cointegrating relationship between regional value added, physical capital and human capital-augmented labor. When common time effects and individual trends are included in the model, the regional production function tends to be characterized by constant or even decreasing returns to scale. Otherwise, the production function exhibits slightly increasing returns to scale, in line with endogenous growth theories.

A further step in our research agenda could be the adoption of recently developed estimators that model cross-section dependence using a common factor structure (Westerlund, 2005). Through these techniques it will also be possible to model the inclusion of other variables (infrastructure, etc.) in the production function.

## Appendix

### A. Bai and Ng panel unit root test

Consider the following model with individual effect and without time trend:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_i' F_t + e_{it} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $F_t$  is a  $r \times 1$  vector of common factors and  $\lambda_i$  is a vector of factor loadings.<sup>14</sup>

Among the  $r$  common factors, we allow  $r_0$  and  $r_1$  to be stochastic common trends with  $r_0 + r_1 = r$ . The corresponding model in first difference is:

$$\Delta y_{it} = \lambda_i' F_t + z_{it} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $z_{it} = \Delta e_{it}$  and  $f_t = \Delta F_t$  with  $E(f_t) = 0$ . Applying the principal-components approach to  $\Delta y_{it}$  yields  $r$  estimated factors  $\hat{f}_t$ , the associated loadings  $\hat{\lambda}_i$ , and the estimated residuals,  $z_{it} = y_{it} - \hat{\lambda}_i' \hat{f}_t$ .

If we define:

$$\hat{e}_{it} = \sum_{s=2}^t \hat{z}_{is}$$

$$\hat{F}_t = \sum_{s=2}^t \hat{z}_{is}, \text{ an } r \times 1 \text{ vector, for } t = 2, \dots, T,$$

then we have:

1. Let  $ADF_{\hat{e}}^c(i)$  be the  $t$  statistics for testing  $d_{i0} = 0$  in the univariate augmented autoregression (with no deterministic terms):

$$\Delta \hat{e}_{it} = d_{i0} \hat{e}_{it-1} + d_{i1} \Delta \hat{e}_{it-1} + \dots + d_{ip} \Delta \hat{e}_{it-p} + error \quad (\text{A.3})$$

2. If  $r = 1$ , let  $ADF_{\hat{F}}^c$  be the  $t$  statistics for testing  $\delta_{i0} = 0$  in the univariate augmented autoregression (with an intercept):

$$\Delta \hat{F}_t = c + \delta_{i0} \hat{F}_{t-1} + \delta_{i1} \Delta \hat{F}_{t-1} + \dots + \delta_{ip} \Delta \hat{F}_{t-p} + error \quad (\text{A.4})$$

3. If  $r > 1$ , demean  $\hat{F}_t$  and denote  $\hat{F}_t^c = \hat{F}_t - \bar{\hat{F}}$ , where  $\bar{\hat{F}} = (T-1)^{-1} \sum_{t=2}^T \hat{F}_t$ .

Start with  $m = r$ ;

<sup>14</sup>Specifically, the idiosyncratic error follows this process:  $(1 - \rho_i L) e_{it} = D_i(L) \epsilon_{it}$ .

- A.  $\hat{\beta}_\perp$  denotes the  $m$  eigenvectors associated with the  $m$  largest eigenvalues of  $T^{-2} \sum_{t=2}^T \hat{F}_t^c \hat{F}_t^{c'}$  and  $\hat{Y}_t^c = \hat{\beta}_\perp' \hat{F}_t^c$ . Two different statistics may be considered:
- B.I Let  $K(j) = 1 - j/(j+1)$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ :
- i) Let  $\hat{\xi}_t^c$  be the residuals from estimating a first-order VAR in  $\hat{Y}_t^c$ . In addition, let
- $$\hat{\Sigma}_1^c = \sum_{j=1}^J K(j) \left( T^{-1} \sum_{t=2}^T \hat{\xi}_{t-j}^c \hat{\xi}_t^{c'} \right)$$
- ii) Let  $v_c^c(m)$  be the smallest eigenvalue of
- $$\Phi_c^c(m) = 0.5 \left[ \sum_{t=2}^T \left( \hat{Y}_t^c \hat{Y}_{t-1}^{c'} + \hat{Y}_{t-1}^c \hat{Y}_t^{c'} \right) - T \left( \hat{\Sigma}_1^c + \hat{\Sigma}_1^{c'} \right) \right] \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \hat{Y}_t^c \hat{Y}_{t-1}^{c'} \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{A.5})$$
- iii) Define  $MQ_c^c(m) = T \left[ \hat{v}_c^c(m) - 1 \right]$ .
- B.II For  $p$  fixed that does not depend on  $N$  and  $T$
- i) Estimate a VAR of order  $p$  in  $\Delta \hat{Y}_t^c$  to get  $\hat{\Pi}(L) = I_m - \hat{\Pi}_1 L - \dots - \hat{\Pi}_p L^p$  and filter  $\hat{Y}_t^c$  by  $\hat{\Pi}(L)$ , we have:  $\hat{y}_t^c = \hat{\Pi}(L) \hat{Y}_t^c$ .
- ii) Let  $\hat{v}_f^c(m)$  be the smallest eigenvalue of :
- $$\Phi_f^c(m) = 0.5 \left[ \sum_{t=2}^T \left( \hat{y}_t^c \hat{y}_{t-1}^{c'} + \hat{y}_{t-1}^c \hat{y}_t^{c'} \right) \right] \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \hat{y}_t^c \hat{y}_{t-1}^{c'} \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{A.6})$$
- iii) Define the statistic  $MQ_f^c(m) = T \left[ \hat{v}_f^c(m) - 1 \right]$
- C. If  $H_0 : r_1 = m$  is rejected, set  $m = m - 1$  and return to step A. Otherwise,  $\hat{r}_1 = m$  and stop.

## B. Moon and Perron panel unit root test

The simple dynamic model provided by MP consists in the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= \alpha_i + y_{it}^0 \\ y_{it}^0 &= \rho_i y_{it-1}^0 + \varepsilon_{it}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where  $y_{it}^0 = 0$  for all  $i$ .<sup>15</sup> To model the cross-correlation, BM assume that the error term  $\varepsilon_{it}$  follows a factor model:

$$\varepsilon_{it} = \beta_i^{0t} f_t^0 + e_{it} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where  $f_t^0$  are  $K$ -vectors of unobservable random factor,  $\beta_i^0$  are non-random factor loading coefficient vectors (also  $K$ -vectors),  $e_{it}$  are idiosyncratic shocks, and the number of factor  $K$  is possibly unknown.

Under the null hypothesis of  $\rho_i = 1$  for all  $i=1,2,\dots,N$ ,  $y_{it}$  is influenced by two components: the integrated factor  $\sum_{s=1}^T f_s^0$  and the idiosyncratic errors  $\sum_{s=1}^T e_{is}$ . With

respect to the BNG test, the MP test is based only on the estimated idiosyncratic component. MP treat the factors as a nuisance parameter and propose to pool de-factored data. MP suggest removing cross-sectional dependence in the model (B.1-B.2) by multiplying the observed matrix  $Y$  of the dimension  $(T \times N)$  by the projection matrix  $Q_B$  and compute the unbiased pooled autoregressive estimator as:

$$\rho_{pool}^+ = \frac{\text{tr}(Y_{-1} Q_B Y' - NT \lambda_e^N)}{\text{tr}(Y_{-1} Q_B Y_{-1}')} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $Y_{-1}$  is the matrix of the lagged observed data,  $\text{tr}(\cdot)$  is the trace operator and  $\lambda_e^N$  is the cross-sectional average of the one-sided long run variance of the idiosyncratic errors  $e_{it}$ . The vector of factor loading  $\hat{\beta}$  and the projection matrix  $Q_B$  are obtained by estimating the principal component of  $\hat{e}'\hat{e} = (Y - \hat{\rho}_{pool} Y_{-1})' (Y - \hat{\rho}_{pool} Y_{-1})$ , where  $\hat{\rho}_{pool}$  is the OLS pooled autoregressive estimate.

---

<sup>15</sup> MP also consider a model with incidental trend:  $y_{it} = \alpha_{ki}' g_{kt} + y_{it}^0$ , where  $g_{0t} = 1$  and  $g_{1t} = (1, t)'$ .

### C. Mark and Sul estimation procedure

Mark and Sul start from the Kao and Chang approach by assuming that the cointegrating vector is homogenous across individuals, but they allow for individual heterogeneity through disparate short-run dynamics, individual-specific fixed effect and individual-specific time trends. In addition, a limited degree of cross-sectional dependence through the presence of time-specific effects is considered. Consider the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= \alpha_i + \lambda_i t + \vartheta_i + \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it} + u_{it}^\dagger \\ \Delta \underline{x}_{it} &= \underline{v}_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (C.1)$$

where  $(1, -\underline{\gamma}')$  is the cointegrating vector between  $y_{it}$  and  $\underline{x}_{it}$  which is identical across individuals.

The equilibrium error  $y_{it} - \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it}$  may include an individual-specific effect  $\alpha_i$ , an individual-specific linear trend  $\lambda_i t$ , and a common time-specific factor  $\vartheta_i$ . The remaining idiosyncratic error  $u_{it}^\dagger$  is independent across  $i$  but possibly dependent across  $t$ . An alternative representation of the previous equation allows  $\underline{x}_{it}$  to have an individual-specific vector of drift terms and for the trend in the same equation to be induced by this drift. Mark and Sul consider the panel DOLS estimator of the vector of slope coefficients  $\underline{\gamma}$ . When the individual-specific constant ( $\lambda_i = 0$ ,  $\vartheta_i = 0$ ) is included in the regression (C.1), we have:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it} + u_{it}^\dagger \quad (C.2)$$

MS assume that  $u_{it}^\dagger$  is correlated with at most  $p_i$  leads and lags of  $\underline{v}_{it} = \Delta \underline{x}_{it}$ . In order to control for endogeneity problems, MS choose to project  $u_{it}^\dagger$  onto these  $p_i$  leads and lags:

$$u_{it}^\dagger = \sum_{s=-p_i}^{p_i} \underline{\delta}_{i,s}' \underline{v}_{it-s} + u_{it} = \sum_{s=-p_i}^{p_i} \underline{\delta}_{i,s}' \Delta \underline{x}_{it-s} + u_{it} = \underline{\delta}_i' \underline{z}_{it} + u_{it} \quad (C.3)$$

where  $\underline{\delta}_{i,s}$  is a  $k \times 1$  vector of projection coefficients,  $\underline{\delta}_i = (\underline{\delta}_{i,-p}, \dots, \underline{\delta}_{i,0}, \dots, \underline{\delta}_{i,p_i})'$  is a  $(2p_i + 1)k$ -dimensional vector and  $\underline{z}_{it} = (\Delta \underline{x}_{it-p_i}', \dots, \Delta \underline{x}_{it}', \Delta \underline{x}_{it+p_i}')'$  is a  $(2p_i + 1)k$ -vector of leads and lags of the first difference of the variables  $\underline{x}_{it}$ . By substituting the projection representation for  $u_{it}^\dagger$  in the equation (C.3) into the equation (C.2), we have:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \underline{z}_{it} + u_{it} \quad (C.4)$$

The projection defines the new covariance stationary process,  $\underline{w}_{it} = (u_{it}, \underline{v}_{it}')'$  where for each  $i$ ,

$$\underline{w}_{it} = \Psi_i(L) \underline{\varepsilon}_{it}, \quad \Psi_i(L) = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{uu,i}(L) & \underline{0}' \\ \underline{0} & \Psi_{vv,i}(L) \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $\underline{w}_{it}$  satisfies the functional central limit theorem

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{w}_{it} \xrightarrow{D} \underline{B}_i = \Psi_i(1) \underline{W}_i$$

where  $\underline{B}_i = (B_{ui}, B_{vi})'$ ,  $B_{ui}$  and  $B_{vi}$  are independent, and

$$\Omega_i = E[\underline{B}_i(1) \underline{B}_i(1)'] = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{uu,i}(1)^2 & \underline{0}' \\ \underline{0} & \Psi_{vv,i}(1) \Psi_{vv,i}(1)' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{uu,i} & \underline{0}' \\ \underline{0} & \Omega_{vv,i} \end{bmatrix}$$

If we take the time-series average of the equation (C. 4), we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it} = \alpha_i + \underline{\gamma}' \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{x}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{z}_{it} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u_{it} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

By subtracting the previous equation from the equation (C.4), we obtain:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \underline{\gamma}' \tilde{\underline{x}}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \tilde{\underline{z}}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where a “tilde” denotes the deviation of an observation from its time series average,

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = y_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it}$$

$$\tilde{\underline{x}}_{it} = \underline{x}_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{x}_{it}$$

$$\tilde{\underline{z}}_{it} = \underline{z}_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{z}_{it}$$

$$\tilde{u}_{it} = u_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u_{it}$$

To solve the estimation problem, let  $\tilde{\underline{q}}_{it}$  is the  $2k \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \right)$  dimensional vector of

which the first  $k$  elements are  $\tilde{\underline{x}}_{it}$ , elements  $k \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (2p_j + 1) \right) + 1$  to

$k \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^i (2p_j + 1) \right)$  are  $\tilde{\underline{z}}_{it}$  and 0s elsewhere.

In other words,

$$\tilde{\underline{q}}_{1t} = (\tilde{\underline{x}}_{1t} \quad \tilde{\underline{z}}_{1t}' \quad \underline{0}' \quad \dots \quad \underline{0}')'$$

$$\tilde{\underline{q}}_{2t} = (\tilde{\underline{x}}_{2t} \quad \underline{0}' \quad \tilde{\underline{z}}_{2t}' \quad \dots \quad \underline{0}')'$$

.

.

.

$$\tilde{\underline{q}}_{Nt} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_{Nt} & \underline{0}' & \underline{0}' & \dots & \tilde{z}_{Nt}' \end{pmatrix}'$$

Let the grand coefficient vector be  $\underline{\beta} = (\underline{\gamma}', \underline{\delta}_1', \dots, \underline{\delta}_N')'$  and the compact form of the regression  $\tilde{y}_{it} = \underline{\beta}' \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it}$ . The panel DOLS estimator for the fixed effect model is  $\underline{\beta}_{NT}$ , where

$$(\underline{\beta}_{NT} - \underline{\beta}) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it} \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it}' \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it} \tilde{u}_{it} \right] \quad (C.7)$$

When we consider both individual effects and heterogeneous time trends in the specification of the model and substitute the projection representation for the equilibrium error,

$$u_{it}^* = \sum_{s=-p_i}^{p_i} \underline{\delta}_{i,s}' v_{it-s} + u_{it} = \sum_{s=-p_i}^{p_i} \underline{\delta}_{i,s}' \Delta x_{it-s} + u_{it} = \underline{\delta}_i' z_{it} + u_{it} \quad (C.8)$$

into equation (C.2), we have:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_i t + \underline{\gamma}' \tilde{x}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \tilde{z}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it} \quad (C.9)$$

If we take the time series average of the previous equation, we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_i \left( \frac{t+1}{2} \right) + \underline{\gamma}' \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u_{it} \quad (C.10)$$

where  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T t = \left( \frac{t+1}{2} \right)$ .

By subtracting the (C.10) equation from the equation (C.9), we obtain :

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \lambda_i \tilde{t} + \underline{\gamma}' \tilde{x}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \tilde{z}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it} \quad (C.11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_{it} &= y_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it} \\ \tilde{x}_{it} &= x_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it} \\ \tilde{z}_{it} &= z_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it} \\ \tilde{u}_{it} &= u_{it} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u_{it} \\ \tilde{t} &= t - \frac{T+1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

To set up the panel DOLS estimator, let  $\underline{\lambda}_N = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N)'$ ,  $\underline{\beta} = (\underline{\lambda}', \underline{\lambda}_N', \underline{\delta}_1', \dots, \underline{\delta}_N')'$  and:

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\lambda}_N &= (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N)', \quad \underline{\beta} = (\underline{\gamma}', \lambda_N' \delta_1', \dots, \delta_N')' \\
\tilde{\underline{q}}_{1t}' &= (\tilde{x}_{1t} \quad \tilde{t} \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad \tilde{z}_{1t}' \quad \underline{0}' \quad \dots \quad \underline{0}')' \\
\tilde{\underline{q}}_{2t}' &= (\tilde{x}_{2t} \quad 0 \quad \tilde{t} \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad \underline{0}' \quad \tilde{z}_{2t}' \quad \dots \quad \underline{0}')' \\
&\vdots \\
\tilde{\underline{q}}_{Nt}' &= (\tilde{x}_{Nt} \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad \tilde{t} \quad \underline{0}' \quad \underline{0}' \quad \dots \quad \tilde{z}_{Nt}')'
\end{aligned}$$

The panel DOLS estimator of  $\underline{\beta}$  is:

$$\underline{\beta}_{NT} = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it} \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it}' \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\underline{q}}_{it} \tilde{y}_{it} \right] \quad (\text{C.12})$$

When we introduce the common time effect in order to allow a limited form of cross-sectional dependence and substitute the projection representation for  $u_{it}^\dagger$  in the equation

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it} + u_{it}^\dagger,$$

we have :

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_i t + \vartheta_i + \underline{\gamma}' \tilde{x}_{it} + \underline{\delta}_i' \tilde{z}_{it} + \tilde{u}_{it} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Controlling for the common time effect requires an analysis of the cross-sectional average of the observations. Because MS admit heterogeneity in the projection coefficients  $\delta_i$  across  $i$ , the resulting cross-sectional averages will involve sums such as

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \underline{\delta}_j' \underline{z}_{jt}$$

which complicates estimation of the  $\delta_i$  coefficients. The estimation problem

can be simplified by proceeding sequentially and addressing the endogeneity correction separately from co-integration vector estimation.

To this end, let  $y_{it}^{\dagger\dagger}$  be the error from projecting each element of  $y_{it}$  onto  $\underline{n}_{it} = (1, t, \underline{z}_{it})$  and  $\underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} = \underline{x}_{it} - \Phi_i \underline{n}_{it}$  be the vector of projection errors from projecting each element of  $\underline{x}_{it}$  onto  $\underline{n}_{it}$ , where  $\Phi_i$  is a  $(k+2) \times p_i$  matrix of projection coefficients. By substituting the projection representations for  $y_{it}$  and  $x_{it}$  into equation (C.13), we have:

$$\tilde{y}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} = \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} + \vartheta_i + u_{it} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

To estimate the parameter  $\underline{\gamma}$  in the equation (C.13), equation (C.14) is used. Taking the cross-sectional average of equation (C.14), we have:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} = \underline{\gamma}' \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} \right] + \vartheta_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_{jt} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Subtracting equation (C.15) from equation (C.14) eliminates the common time effect giving:



$$\tilde{y}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} = \underline{\gamma}' \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} + v_t + u_{it}^* \quad (\text{C.16})$$

where the star indicates the deviation of an observation from its cross-sectional average. The panel DOLS estimator of  $\underline{\gamma}$  is:

$$\underline{\gamma}_{NT} = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*0} \right]^{-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} \underline{y}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} \right] \quad (\text{C.17})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} &= y_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N y_{jt}^{\dagger\dagger} \\ \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger*} &= \underline{x}_{it}^{\dagger\dagger} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \underline{x}_{jt}^{\dagger\dagger} \\ u_{it}^* &= u_{it} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_{jt} \end{aligned}$$

**Table 1.** Panel unit root tests. Variable:  $\ln Y$

A. Choi panel test			B. Pesaran panel test		
Pm	Z	L*	p*	CIPS	CIPS*
3.066 (0.001)	-3.103 (0.000)	-2.979 (0.001)	1	-2.238 (0.035)	-2.238 (0.035)
			2	-2.141 (0.075)	
			3	-1.910 (0.280)	
			4	-1.641 (0.635)	

  

C. Bai and Ng panel test				D. Moon and Perron panel test		
$\hat{r}$	Idiosyncratic shocks	Common Factor	$\hat{F}$	$\hat{r}$	t_a*	t_a**
1 (BIC <sub>3</sub> )	-1.589 (0.943)	25.879 (0.959)	-0.787 (0.801)	2	-0.990 (0.161)	-1.237 (0.108)
				$\hat{r}$	t_b*	t_b**
				2	-1.083 (0.139)	-1.048 (0.147)

LEGEND: a) The PM test is the modified Fisher's inverse chi-square test (Choi, 2001). The Z test is an inverse normal test. The L\* test is a modified logit test. All statistics have a standard normal distribution under  $H_0$  when T and N tend to infinity (Choi, 2004a); b) CIPS is the mean of individual cross-sectionally augmented ADF statistics (ADF). CIPS\* indicates the mean of truncated individual CADF statistics. The truncated statistics are reported only for one lag since they are always equal to not truncated one for higher lag lengths. p\* denotes the nearest integer of the mean of the individual lag lengths in ADF tests; c) for each variable, the number of common factor estimated ( $\hat{r}$ ) is estimated by the BIC<sub>3</sub> criterion (we use the BIC<sub>3</sub> criterion because N and T don't have so much difference in magnitude), with a maximum number of factor equal to 5. For idiosyncratic components  $\hat{\epsilon}_{it}$ , the pooled unit root statistic tests are reported.  $P_{\epsilon}^c$  is a Fisher's type statistic based on a p-valued of the individual ASF tests. Under the null hypothesis,  $P_{\epsilon}^c$  has a  $\chi^2(2N)$  distribution where T tends to infinity and N is fixed.  $Z_{\epsilon}^c$  is the standardized Choi's type test statistic. Under the null hypothesis,  $Z_{\epsilon}^c$  has a N(0,1) distribution. For the idiosyncratic components  $\hat{F}_t$ , two different cases must be distinguished: if  $\hat{r} = 1$ , only the standard ADF t-statistic,  $ADF_{\hat{F}}^c$  is reported. If  $\hat{r} > 1$  the estimated number  $\hat{r}$  of independent stochastic trends in the common factors is reported (columns 4 and 5); d) t\_a\* and t\_b\* are the panel unit root test based on de-factored panel data and computed with a quadratic spectral kernel function; e) t\_a\*\* and t\_b\*\* are computed with a Barlett kernel function; f) numbers in parenthesis are p-values.

**Table 2.** Panel unit root tests. Variable:  $\ln K$

A. Choi panel test			B. Pesaran panel test		
Pm	Z	L*	p*	CIPS	CIPS*
1.812 (0.350)	1.588 (0.944)	2.153 (0.984)	1	-1.853 (0.370)	-1.853 (0.370)
			2	-1.525 (0.805)	
			3	-1.704 (0.550)	
			4	-1.349 (0.915)	

  

C. Bai and Ng panel test			D. Moon and Perron panel test		
$\hat{r}$	Idiosyncratic shocks	Common Factor ADFF <sup>c</sup>	$\hat{r}$	t_a*	t_a* <sup>B</sup>
1 (BIC <sub>3</sub> )	-0.859 (0.185)	48.011 (0.180)			
		-2.534 (0.120)	4	-11.383 (0.000)	-12.765 (0.000)
			$\hat{r}$	t_b*	t_b* <sup>B</sup>
			4	-5.719 (0.000)	-6.260 (0.000)

LEGEND: see Table 1.

**Table 3.** Panel unit root tests. Variable:  $\ln L h$

A. Choi panel test			B. Pesaran panel test		
Pm	Z	L*	p*	CIPS	CIPS*
2.830 (0.002)	-2.426 (0.058)	-2.407 (0.061)	1	-1.532 (0.795)	-1.410 (0.823)
			2	-1.391 (0.915)	
			3	-1.566 (0.725)	
			4	-1.092 (0.990)	

  

C. Bai and Ng panel test				D. Moon and Perron panel test		
$\hat{r}$	Idiosyncratic shocks	Common Factor	$\hat{F}$	$\hat{r}$	t_a*	t_a*B
1 (BIC <sub>3</sub> )	-1.249 (0.894)	28.830 (0.905)	ADFF <sup>c</sup> --	4	-7.036 (0.000)	-7.031 (0.000)
				$\hat{r}$	t_b*	t_b*B
				4	-3.893 (0.000)	-3.858 (0.000)

LEGEND: see Table 1.

**Table 4.** *Panel cointegration tests results*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>ADF (Kao)</b>	<b>WR<sub>M</sub> (Westerlund)</b>
ln Y, ln K, ln L h	-2.601 (0.004)	17.461 (0.005)

LEGEND: a) All tests are used to test the null hypothesis of no cointegration; b) For the ADF test, the lag order is set to one. Results are robust to different lag lengths. The WR<sub>M</sub> is developed under the assumption of cross-sectional dependence. t. The distribution depends on the number of regressors (2 in our case), the deterministic specification of the spurious regression (in our analysis only the constant is included) and the number of the cross-sectional units; c) numbers in parenthesis are p-values.

**Table 5.** *Estimation Results. Method: DOLS and FMOLS (Pedroni, 1996, 2000, 2001)*

	<b>ln K</b>	<b>ln L h</b>
<b>DOLS</b>	0.26 [2.12*]	0.79 [4.56*]
<b>DOLS (common time effects)</b>	0.17 [3.21*]	0.82 [2.63*]
<b>FMOLS</b>	0.26 [14.27*]	0.89 [16.75*]
<b>FMOLS (common time effects)</b>	0.16 [4.18*]	0.60 [5.31*]

LEGEND: a) common time effects control for cross-sectional dependence; b) numbers in brackets are t-statistics; c) \*denotes significant at 5% level

**Table 6.** *Estimation Results. Method: PDOLS (Mark and Sul, 2003)*

	<b>ln K</b>	<b>ln L h</b>
<b>PDOLS (individual effects)</b>	0.20 [2.22*]	1.07 [4.54*]
<b>PDOLS (individual and common time effects)</b>	0.13 [2.18*]	1.11 [6.43*]
<b>PDOLS (individual effects and heterogenous trends)</b>	0.10 [0.62]	0.71 [3.10*]
<b>PDOLS (individual effects, common time effects and heterogenous trends)</b>	0.09 [0.65]	0.67 [2.61*]

LEGEND: a) common time effects control for cross-sectional dependence; b) numbers in brackets are the t-statistics based on parametrically corrected standard errors; c) \*denotes significant at 5% level.

## References

- Aiello F., Scoppa V. (2000), Uneven Regional Development in Italy: Explaining Differences in Productivity Levels, *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia*, 60, 2, 270-98.
- Aschauer D.A. (1989), Is Public Expenditure Productive?, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 23, 177-200.
- Bai J., Ng S. (2004), A PANIC attack on unit root and cointegration, *Econometrica*, 72, 1991-221.
- Brunello G., Comi S., Lucifora C. (1999), *The Returns to Education in Italy: A New Look at the Evidence*, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Nota di Lavoro, n. 101.99.
- Canning D. (1999), The Contribution of Infrastructure to Aggregate Output, *The World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 2246, November.
- Chang Y. (2002), Nonlinear IV Unit Root Tests in Panels with Cross-Sectional Dependency, *Journal of Econometrics*, 110, 261-292.
- Chang Y. (2004), Bootstrap Tests in Panels with Cross-Sectional Dependency, *Journal of Econometrics*, 120, 263-293.
- Choi I. (2001), Unit Root Tests for Panel Data, *Journal of International Money and Banking*, 20, 249-272.
- Choi I. (2004a), Unit Root Tests for Cross-Sectionally Correlated Panels, forthcoming in Saikkonen P. and I. Choi (eds.), *Econometric Theory and Practice: Frontiers of Analysis and Applied Research: Essays in Honor of Peter C.B. Phillips*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Choi I. (2004b), Nonstationary Panels, forthcoming in Choi I. and P. Saikkonen (eds.), *Palgrave Handbooks of Econometrics*, Vol. 1.
- Destefanis S., Taddeo A., Tornatore M. (2004), *The stock of human capital in the Italian regions*, WP 3.142, DISES, University of Salerno, (downloadable at <http://www.dise.unisa.it/docenti/destefanis.htm>).
- Elliot G., Rothenberg T. J., Stock J. H. (1996), Efficient tests for an Autoregressive Unit Root, *Econometrica*, 64, 813-836.
- Fisher R. A. (1932), *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 4<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Garcia-Milà T., McGuire T., Porter R. (1996), The Effect of Public Capital in State-Level Production Functions Reconsidered, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 22, 229-241.
- Gleed R.H., Rees R.D. (1979), The Derivation of Regional Capital Stock Estimates for UK Manufacturing Industries, 1951-73, *Journal Royal Statistical Society*, 142, 330-346.
- Gutierrez L. (2003), *Panel Unit Root Tests for Cross-Sectionally Correlated Panels: A Monte Carlo Comparison*. Mimeo, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Sassari.
- Hall R.E., Jones C.I. (1999), Why do some countries produce so much more output per worker than others?, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114, 83-116.

- Holtz-Eakin D. (1994), Public-sector capital and the productivity puzzle. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 76, 12–21.
- Hurlin C. (2004), *Nelson and Plosser Revisited: A Re-Examination Using OECD Panel Data*. Mimeo, LEO, University of Orléans.
- Im K. S., Pesaran M. H., Shin Y. (1997), *Testing for Unit Roots in Heterogeneous Panels*. Mimeo, Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge.
- Im K. S., Pesaran M. H., Shin Y. (2003), Testing for Unit Roots in Heterogeneous Panels, *Journal of Econometrics*, 115, 53-74.
- Islam N. (1995), Growth Empirics: a Panel Data Approach, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110, 1127-1170.
- Kao C. (1999), Spurious Regression and Residual-Based tests for Cointegration in Panel Data, *Journal of Econometrics*, 90, 1-44.
- Kao C., Chiang, M. H. (2000), On the Estimation and Inference of a Cointegrated Regression in Panel Data, *Advances in Econometrics*, 15, 179-222.
- Levin A., Lin C. F. (1992), Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: Asymptotic and Finite-Sample Properties, *Working Paper n.23*, University of California, San Diego.
- Levin A., Lin C. F. (1993), Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: New Results, *Working Paper n.56*, University of California, San Diego.
- Levin A., Lin C. F., Chu C.S.J. (2002), Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: Asymptotic and Finite Sample Properties, *Journal of Econometrics*, 108, 1-24.
- Maddala G. S., Wu S. (1999), A Comparative Study of Unit Root Tests with Panel Data and a New Simple Test. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61 (Special Issue), 631-652.
- Mankiw, G., Romer D., Weil D. (1992), A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, 407-438.
- Marrocu E., Paci R., Pala R. (2000), Estimation of total factor productivity for regions and sectors in Italy. A panel cointegration approach, *RISEC, Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali*, 48, 533-58.
- Mark C. N., Sul, D. (2003). Cointegration Vector Estimation by Panel DOLS and Long-run Money Demand, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 65, 655-680.
- McCoskey S., Kao C. (1999), Testing the Stability of a Production Function with Urbanization as a Shift Factor, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61 (Special Issue), 691-709.
- Moon H. R., Perron, B. (2004), Testing for a Unit Root in Panels with Dynamic Factor, *Journal of Econometrics*, 122, 81-126.
- O'Connell P. G. J. (1998), The overvaluation of purchasing power parity, *Journal of International Economics*, 44, 1-19.
- Paci R., Pusceddu N. (2000) Stima dello stock di capitale nelle regioni italiane, *Rassegna Economica, Quaderni di Ricerca*, 97-118.
- Pedroni P. (1996), Fully Modified OLS for Heterogeneous Cointegrated Panels and the Case of Purchasing Power Parity, *Indiana University Working Papers in Economics*, No. 96-020.



- Pedroni P. (2000), Fully Modified OLS for Heterogeneous Cointegrated Panels, *Advances in Econometrics*, 15, 93-130.
- Pedroni P. (2001), Purchasing Power Parity Tests in Cointegrated Panels, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83, 727-731.
- Pesaran M. H. (2005) *A simple panel unit root test in the presence of cross section dependence*, mimeo, Cambridge University and USC.
- Phillips P. C. B., Sul D. (2003), Dynamic Panel Estimation and Homogeneity Testing Under Cross Section Dependence, *Econometric Journal*, 6, 217-259.
- Westerlund J. (2004), *New simple tests for panel cointegration*, Mimeo, School of Economics and Management, Lund University.
- Westerlund J. (2005), *Unbiased Estimation of Cointegrated Panel Regressions with Common Factors*, mimeo, School of Economics and Management, Lund University.

## CELPE's Discussion Papers

- 2005, 93 Sergio DESTEFANIS, Raquel FONSECA  
Matching Efficiency and Labor Market Reform in Italy. A Macroeconometric Assessment
- 2005, 92 Cesare IMBRIANI, Antonio LOPES  
Banking System Efficiency and the Dualistic Development of the Italian Economy in the Nineties
- 2005, 91 Carlo ALTAVILLA, Antonio GAROFALO, Concetto Paolo VINCI  
Designing the Optimal Length of Working Time
- 2005, 90 Marco MANACORDA, Barbara PETRONGOLO  
Regional Mismatch and Unemployment: Theory and Evidence from Italy, 1977-1998
- 2004, 89 Roberta TROISI  
Teoria dell'impresa e responsabilità parapenale: le implicazioni organizzativo-gestionali.
- 2004, 88 Roberta TROISI  
Enti non profit: tipologie ed opzioni organizzative
- 2004, 87 Lavinia PARISI  
La povertà: una rassegna sul confronto tra due approcci. Capability vs. Unidimensionalità
- 2004, 86 Giuseppe CELI  
Quality Differentiation, Vertical Disintegration and the Labor Market Effects of Intra-Industry Trade
- 2004, 85 Niall O'HIGGINS  
Recent Trends in Youth Labor Markets and Employment Policy in Europe and Central Asia
- 2004, 84 Carlo ALTAVILLA, Floro Ernesto CAROLEO  
Evaluating Asymmetries in Active Labor Policies: The Case of Italy
- 2004, 83 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO, Francesco PASTORE  
La disoccupazione giovanile in Italia. La riforma dei sistemi d'istruzione e di formazione professionale come alternativa alla flessibilità numerica per accrescere l'occupabilità
- 2004, 82 Francesco PASTORE, Izabela MARCINKOWSKA  
The Gender Wage Gap among Young People in Italy
- 2004, 81 Elisabetta MARZANO  
Dual Labor Market Theories And Irregular Jobs: Is There a Dualism Even in The Irregular Sector?
- 2004, 80 Corrado ANDINI  
Unemployment and Welfare Partecipation in a Structural VAR: Rethinking the 1990s in the United States
- 2004, 79 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO  
Fondamenti teorici della rigidità salariale nell'ambito dei "Non Market clearing

Models"

- 2004, 78 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Floro Ernesto CAROLEO, Gianluigi COPPOLA  
Regional Disparities in Europe
- 2003, 77 Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
Flessibilità, povertà e istruzione: un approccio Sen – istituzionale
- 2003, 76 Adalgiso AMENDOLA., Annamaria NESE  
Mobilità intergenerale nel livello d'istruzione nella società femminile italiana ed endogenità de titolo di studio in un modello di partecipazione alla Forza Lavoro.
- 2003, 74 Antonio LOPES  
Innovazione nel Sistema Creditizio del Mezzogiorno negli Anni Novanta
- 2003, 73 Sergio DESTEFANIS - Vania SENA  
Public Capital and Total Factor Productivity New Evidence from the Italian Regions
- 2003, 72 Giuseppina AUTIERO - Bruna BRUNO  
Social Preferences in Wage Bargaining: a Neocorporatist Approach
- 2003, 71 Gianluigi COPPOLA - Maria Rosaria GAROFALO - Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
Industrial Localisation and Economic Development. A Case Study
- 2002, 70 Francesco Giordano – Fernanda Mazzotta  
Salario di Riserva, Probabilità di Occupazione ed Efficacia dell'Istruzione Universitaria: un'Analisi sugli Studenti dell'Università di Salerno
- 2002, 69 Giuseppe Russo  
Istituzioni del Mercato del Lavoro e Occupazione: dai Costi di Aggiustamento all'Appropriabilità
- 2002, 68 Floro Ernesto Caroleo - Francesco Pastore  
Training Policy for Youth Unemployed in a Sample of European Countries
- 2002, 67 Maria Rosaria GAROFALO - Maria Rosaria SUPINO  
Il Disegno Normativo del Welfare Municipale in Italia come Strumento per lo Sviluppo Economico e l'Allargamento delle Opportunità Occupazionali. Una Lettura Neoistituzionale della L. 328/00
- 2002, 65 Pietro SENESI  
Cyclical dynamics under continuous time equilibrium
- 2001, 64 Marcello D'AMATO - Vincenzo GALASSO  
E' la Riforma Dini Politicamente Sostenibile?
- 2001, 63 Sergio DESTEFANIS - Ornella Wanda MAIETTA  
"Assessing the Productive Efficiency of Non-Profit Organisations: a Comparative Analysis"
- 2001, 62 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO - Francesco PASTORE  
How fine targeted is ALMP to the youth long term unemployed in Italy?
- 2001, 61 Paolo COCCORESE  
Strategic Advertising for Entry Deterrence Purposes
- 2001, 60 Alessandra AMENDOLA  
Modelling Asymmetries in Unemployment Rate

- 2001, 59 Sergio DESTEFANIS  
*Differenziali Territoriali di Produttività ed Efficienza negli Anni '90: i Livelli e l'Andamento*
- 2001, 58 Giuseppina AUTIERO - Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*Job Search Methods: the Choice between the Public and the Private Sector*
- 2001, 57 Giuseppina AUTIERO - Bruna BRUNO - Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*A Correspondence Analysis of Labor Market Institutions*
- 2000, 56 Giuseppina AUTIERO  
*Governmental Organized Learning and Coordination Problems: The case of Japan in 1950s*
- 2000, 55 Giuseppina AUTIERO - Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*The Choice of Search Methods: Some Empirical Evidence from Italy*
- 2000, 54 Giuseppe CELI  
*The Impact of International Trade on Labor Markets. The Case of Outward Processing Traffic between the European Union and Central Eastern European Countries.*
- 2000, 53 Giuseppe RUSSO - David VEREDAS  
*Institutional Rigidities and Employment on the Italian Labor Market: the Dynamic of the Employment in the Large Industrial Firms.*
- 2000, 52 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO  
*Le Politiche per l'Occupazione in Europa: una Tassonomia Istituzionale*
- 2000, 51 Andrew NEWELL - Francesco PASTORE  
*Regional Unemployment and Industrial Restructuring in Poland*
- 1999, 50 Giuseppe CELI - Alasdair SMITH  
*Quality Differentiation and the Labor Market Effects of International Trade.*
- 1999, 49 Giuseppe CELI  
*Vertical and Horizontal Intra-Industry Trade: What is the Empirical Evidence for the UK?*
- 1999, 48 Cesare IMBRIANI - Filippo REGANATI  
*Productivity spillovers and regional differences: some evidence on the italian manufacturing sector.*
- 1999, 47 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Annamaria NESE  
*L'impatto del background familiare sul livello d'istruzione dei figli.*
- 1998, 46 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Annamaria NESE  
*Mobilità intergenerazionale nella società femminile italiana.*
- 1998, 45 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO, Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*Youth Unemployment and youth employment policies in Italy.*
- 1997, 44 Annamaria NESE  
*Mobilità intergenerazionale in Italia*
- 1997, 43 Adriana BARONE, Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*Fairness: un concetto relativo nell'analisi del mercato del lavoro*
- 1997, 42 Adriana BARONE, Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*Wage differentials and factor intensity reversals*

- 1997, 41 Rosa CAPOLUPO  
*L'ipotesi di convergenza nel recente dibattito sulle teorie della crescita*
- 1997, 40 Rosa CAPOLUPO  
*Endogenous vs exogenous models of growth: the convergence debate*
- 1997, 39 Fernanda MAZZOTTA, Annamaria NESE  
*Transizioni "In and Out" il mercato del lavoro in Italia: un'analisi microeconometrica*
- 1997, 38 Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*Disoccupazione e probabilità di occupazione in Italia: un'analisi su microdati*
- 1997, 37 Maria Rosaria GAROFALO, Bruna BRUNO  
*Equivalenza istituzionale" dei modelli di contrattazione sul salario: oltre il dibattito tra centralizzazione e decentramento*
- 1997, 36 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Floro Ernesto CAROLEO, Gianluigi COPPOLA  
*Differenziali territoriali nel mercato del lavoro e sviluppo in Italia*
- 1996, 35 Adalgiso AMENDOLA  
*Istituzioni e mercato del lavoro. Deregolazione, occupazione e paradigma istituzionale*
- 1996, 33 Annamaria NESE  
*Modelli microeconomici per l'analisi della domanda abitativa*
- 1996, 32 Annamaria NESE  
*Test semiparametrici per modelli parametrici*
- 1996, 31 Giuseppe CELI  
*Vertical intra-industry trade and skill intensity in Europe: a cross sector analysis*
- 1996, 30 Sergio DESTEFANIS  
*Nominal rigidities and real activity. A cross-industry analysis for Italy, 1951-93*
- 1996, 29 Cesare IMBRIANI, Filippo REGANATI  
*International technology transfer into the italian manufacturing sector*
- 1996, 28 Stefania di SERAFINO, Alberto GANDOLFI  
*The choice of the Government optimal procurement mechanism: the first-price sealed bid auction with one and/or two winners.*
- 1996, 27 Raul de LUZENBERGER  
*Redistribution, and public debt with liquidity constraints*
- 1996, 26 Bruno CHIARINI  
*Un modello VAR per la domanda di lavoro*
- 1995, 25 Maria Rosaria CARILLO, Alberto ZAZZARO  
*Innovazione tecnologica e distruzione di capitale umano in un modello neo-shumpeteriano di crescita.*
- 1995, 24 Raul de LUZENBERGER  
*Macroeconomia e politiche redistributive: il caso di vincoli di liquidità*
- 1995, 23 Annamaria NESE  
*Tenure choice and demand for housing in Italy*
- 1995, 22 Filippo REGANATI

*La struttura delle preferenze per prodotti orizzontalmente differenziati.*

- 1995, 21 Sergio DESTEFANIS, Michele LA ROCCA, Cosimo VITALE  
*Forecasting train ticket sales with linear model-based approaches and with edats*
- 1995, 20 Stefania di SERAFINO  
*Bounded rationality and incomplete contracts*
- 1995, 19 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Floro Ernesto CAROLEO, Maria Rosaria GAROFALO  
*Istituzioni, mercato del lavoro e decentramento delle decisioni.*
- 1995, 18 Niall O'HIGGINS  
*Why did the youth training scheme reduce reduce the wages of young people? A story of human capital formation, reservation wages and job offers.*
- 1994, 17 Antonio CARDONE  
*Misure di efficienza: alcuni aspetti teorici*
- 1994, 16 Maria Rosaria GAROFALO, Luisa ZANCHI  
*Neo-corporativismo, centralizzazione e dispersione inter-settoriale dei salari.*
- 1994, 15 Sergio DESTEFANIS  
*Allowing for frequency of negotiation in the aggregate wage equation. A study for italian manufacturing, 1973/92.*
- 1994, 14 Marcello D'AMATO  
*Tariffs for a foreign industry with market power under incomplete information on demand*
- 1994, 13 Raul DE LUZENBERGER, Cesare IMBRIANI, Giancarlo MARINI  
*Sustainability Issues in the process of European Integration*
- 1994, 12 Riccardo MARSELLI, Antonio CARDONE  
*Interdipendenza tra regioni: un'analisi su dati di Panel*
- 1993, 11 Adriana BARONE, Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*Dilemma del prigioniero e persistenza della disoccupazione involontaria*
- 1993, 10 Maria Rosaria CARILLO  
*Mutamenti strutturali ed offerta di lavoro.*
- 1993, 9 Niall O'HIGGINS  
*The effectiveness of YTS in Britain: an analysis of sample selection in the determination of employment and earnings*
- 1993, 8 Giuseppe CELI  
*Politiche valutarie ed integrazione commerciale: l'esperienza dello SME negli anni '80*
- 1992, 7 Paolo COCCORESE  
*Attività innovativa e configurazione industriale*
- 1992, 6 Maria Rosaria GAROFALO, Gian Luigi CORINTO  
*La Razionalità dell'Allocazione del Tempo di Lavoro in Agricoltura. Con un'Applicazione Empirica ad un Sistema Locale attraverso la PL..*
- 1992, 5 Adalgiso AMENDOLA, Maria SCATTAGLIA  
*Disoccupazione e Tassi di Attività nel Mezzogiorno*
- 1992, 4 Floro Ernesto CAROLEO

*La Disoccupazione Strutturale*

- 1991, 3 Giovanni URGÀ  
*Dynamic Models of Labor Demand in the Italian Industrial Sector: Theories and Evidence from Panel Data*
- 1991, 2 Adalgiso AMENDOLA  
*Teoria dei Contratti Impliciti. Rigidità del Salario e Disoccupazione*
- 1991, 1 Guido CELLA  
*Sulla Integrazione Produttiva Interregionale: il Caso del Mezzogiorno*





CELPE- Centro di Economia del Lavoro e di Politica Economica  
Università degli Studi di Salerno

Depositato ai sensi di Legge.